



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/434,908      | 11/05/1999  | LANE T. HAUCK        | 0325.00281          | 4529             |

21363 7590 06/06/2003

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.  
24025 GREATER MACK  
SUITE 200  
ST. CLAIR SHORES, MI 48080

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHANH DUY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

21

|                              |                 |                    |
|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No. | Applicant(s)       |
|                              | 09/434,908      | HAUCK, LANE T. (D) |
| Examiner                     | Art Unit        |                    |
| Chanh Nguyen                 | 2675            |                    |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-17 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-17 and 19-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment After Final***

1. The amendment after final and declaration under 37 C.F.R 1.131 filed on October 03, 2002 have been entered and considered by examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 15-17, 19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretschneider et al (U.S. Patent no. 6,128,629) in view of Sartore et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,103).

As to claim 1, Bretschneider discloses an apparatus including a first device (e.g., mouse 42) configured to present one or more control signals in response to one or more input instructions (e.g., mouse clicks from mouse 42); see column 4, lines 40-60. Bretschneider teaches a bus interface (USB) to receive one or more control signals; see column 4, lines 40-60. The only thing Lin does not show is a bus interface configured to provide power to the device. In the same field of endeavor, Sartore teaches the peripheral USB interface circuit (120) providing a power (D+) to the device (peripheral

USB interface circuit (120). It is noted that Sartore teaches that "although the electronic disconnection and reconnection of the peripheral device to the USB may be initiated by the host computer, it may also be initiated by the host computer, as described above" (see column 8, lines 43-46). Thus, it is clear that the D+ voltage in Sartore can be transmitted from the host computer to the peripheral device through USB bus.

The claimed "wherein said device is configured to operate as a standard device provided in an operating system" is taught by both Bretschneider and Sartore. For example, Bretschneider teaches that "a user may enter commands and information into the personal computer 20 through input devices such as keyboard 40 and pointing device 42" (see column 4, lines 44-54). It is clear that the device (40, 42) is not a special device or a non-standard device provided in an operating system because it operates the same way as a mouse, keyboard. No where in the reference of Bretschneider states that the pointer is a non-standard device. Moreover, the term "standard" is so broad that any device can be named as standard. One example is that VHS cassette recorder and BETA cassette recorder. Both VHS and BETA can be named as standard cassette recorders because both can hook-up to the television to record the image even BETA does not have commercial success. Sartore uses two USB interfaces (66, 76) to communicate between two processors (62 from a host computer and 72 from a peripheral device which is the same way as applicant's disclosed device shown in figure 2. Thus, the device (peripheral device such as mouse, keyboard) in Sartore is a standard device as recited in the claim.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have substituted UBS bus to provide power to the peripheral device as taught by Sartore to the UBS bus to Bretschneider because UBS bus of Sartore provide a system for easily altering the configuration data for a peripheral device; see column 2, lines 20-68 of Sartore.

As to claim 2, Bretschneider clearly teaches a well-known program configured to either advance or retreat through a plurality of slides in response to the one or more control signals. For example, column 1, lines 41-50 of Bretschneider teaches using a keyboard or mouse to for commanding for next slides as well as Figure 5B shows using left and right arrow icons to forward the slides or retreat the slides.

As to claim 3, Bretschneider clearly teaches a second device (e.g., computer 21) configure to run the program and communicate through the bus (UBS); see column 4, lines 40-60.

As to claim 4, both Bretschneider and Sartore clearly teaches bus interface including a Universal Serial Bus bus interface (66, 76 in Sartore).

As to claim 5, it is well-known in the art the bus interface is a wireless link.

As to claims 7-12 and 15, all the limitations recited in claims 6-12 and 15 are met by either by Bretschneider or Sartore. Bretschneider teaches a mouse (42) having a plurality of control buttons as recited in claims 11 and 15. Sartore teaches that "the UBS also permits the connection and disconnection of USB compatible peripheral devices while the computer is turned on"; see column 1, lines 50-55. This reads on the limitation "without rebooting or repowering the computer" as recited in claim 9.

As to claims 21-23, Bretschneider clearly teaches a hand held device (mouse 42) as recited in claim 21, standard device (mouse 420 is as recited in claim 22 and human interface device (mouse 42) as recited in claim 23.

As to method claims 16-17 and 19, these method claims are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to apparatus claims 1-15 above.

1. Claims 13-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretschneider in view of Meyn et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,6223).

As to claim 20, note the discussion of Bretschneider above, Bretschneider discloses the apparatus as recited in claim 20 with exception of mentioning "and simultaneously" the electronic presentation program controlled by computer. In the same field of endeavor, Myen teaches that "although the system 10 was intended to be operated by a remote control or by light activated control device...However, most actions can be performed using the keys on the control panel of the projector"; see column 13, lines 51-56. Thus, Meyn clearly teaches both the control device (e.g., laser pointer) and the control panel (e.g., keyboard) can control the electronic presentation program. This read on the claimed limitation "simultaneously" as recited in the claim. For example, a user can use only a laser pointer to scroll and zoom the slides. A user also can scroll the slides of the presentation by using laser pointer, then the user can use the control panel to zoom the slides. Thus a user can use both devices "simultaneously". Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used both laser pointer and control panel to

control a plurality of slides as taught by Meyn to the presentation control system of Bretschneider so that the user has more choice to control the presentation slides, thereby saving time.

As to claims 13-14, the claimed "alert indicator" is broad enough to read on status dialog as taught by Meyn; see column 21, line 63 through column 22, line 5.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-17 and 19-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of declaration under 37 C.F.R 1.131 filed after final rejection, the reference of Bretschneider has been added for new ground of rejection.

**Inquiries**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-6603.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, Steven Saras can be reached at 305-9720.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121  
Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist)  
  
Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or  
proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office  
whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

*CN*  
C.Nguyen  
June 4, 2003

*Chanh Nguyen*  
CHANH NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER